

A STANDARD MODEL SOLUTION TO THE SOLAR NEUTRINO PROBLEM?[★]

ARNON DAR AND GIORA SHAVIV

*Department of Physics and Asher Space Research Institute,
Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel.*

ABSTRACT

An improved standard solar model, with more accurate input parameters and more accurate treatment of plasma physics effects, predicts a solar neutrino flux which is consistent within experimental uncertainties with the solar neutrino observations after 1986.

[★] Supported in part by the Technion Fund For Promotion of Research

The Sun is a typical main sequence star that generates its energy by the pp chain and CNO nuclear cycle¹, which also produce neutrinos. These neutrinos have been observed by four pioneering solar neutrino ($\nu_\odot$) experiments, the Chlorine experiment at Homestake, the Cerenkov light water experiment at Kamiokande, the Soviet-American Gallium experiment (SAGE) at Baksan and the European Gallium experiment (GALLEX) at Grand Sasso, but the measured $\nu_\odot$ fluxes are significantly below those predicted by Standard Solar Models² (SSM): The Cl experiment observed over 20 years an average production rate of³ 2.28 ± 0.23 *SNU* (*SNU* = 10^{-36} captures/atom s) of ^{37}Ar by solar ν_e 's with energies above 0.81 *MeV* while the SSM predicts 7.4 ± 2.8 *SNU* (unless otherwise stated, we will use the predictions of Bahcall and Pinsennault² (BP) as a standard reference). Kamiokande has observed since 1987 electron recoils with energy above 7.5 *MeV* from scattering of $\nu_\odot$'s during 1040 (Kamiokande II) and 395 (Kamiokande III) days of detector live time with event rates that are⁴ $51\% \pm 6\%$ and $56\% \pm 6\%$, respectively, of that predicted by the SSM. GALLEX has measured a capture rate of solar ν_e 's by ^{71}Ga of⁵ 87 ± 16 *SNU* in 21 runs between May 1991 and February 1993, compared with 128^{+19}_{-16} *SNU*, predicted by the SSM. SAGE began its $\nu_\odot$ observations in 1990. Its initial results indicated a large discrepancy with the SSM predictions⁶. However, the capture rate observed by SAGE in 1991⁷, $85^{+22}_{-32}[\text{stat}] \pm 20[\text{sys}]$ *SNU*, agrees with that observed by GALLEX. In spite of impressive theoretical and experimental efforts the origin of these discrepancies, which became known as the $\nu_\odot$ problem, is still unknown.

Bahcall and Bethe⁸ have argued that the solution of this $\nu_\odot$ problem requires new physics beyond the Standard Electroweak Model because the Cl detector with an energy threshold of 0.81 MeV observes a smaller solar ν_e flux than that observed

by Kamiokande whose energy threshold is 7.5 MeV. However, after the instalment of new pumps in 1986, the average capture rate measured by the Cl detector is not in a serious conflict with the $\nu_\odot$ flux measured by Kamiokande during the same period (see Fig.1), especially in view of the absence of direct calibration of the Cl experiment. Moreover, the $\nu_\odot$ spectrum measured by Kamiokande II and III is consistent with the ν_e spectrum of ^8B , as predicted by the SSM. Furthermore, the observed capture rates in GALLEX and SAGE are those predicted directly from the solar luminosity and the observed fluxes of the energetic $\nu_\odot$'s in the Homestake and Kamiokande experiments, using essentially only general conservation laws⁹: Since the net outcome in the pp and CNO cycles is the conversion of protons into Helium nuclei, conservation of baryon number, charge lepton flavour and energy requires that $4p + 2e^- \rightarrow ^4\text{He} + 2\nu_e + Q$, where $Q \approx 26.73 \text{ MeV}$, i.e., two ν_e 's are produced in the Sun per 26.73 MeV release of nuclear energy. Thus, if the Sun is approximately in a steady state where its nuclear energy production rate equals its luminosity then the $\nu_\odot$ flux at Earth is given by

$$\phi_{\nu_\odot} = \frac{2L_\odot}{Q - 2\bar{E}_\nu} \frac{1}{4\pi D^2} \approx 6.46 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

where $L_\odot = 3.826(8) \times 10^{33} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ is the Sun's luminosity, $D \approx 1.496 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}$ is its distance from Earth and $\bar{E}_\nu \approx \bar{E}_\nu(pp) \approx 0.265 \text{ MeV}$ is the average $\nu_\odot$ energy (Kamiokande and the Cl experiments observe much smaller fluxes of the more energetic solar neutrinos). If the suppression of the flux of $\nu_\odot$'s other than the pp neutrinos is energy independent and equals that observed at Homestake, $S \equiv \phi_{\nu_\odot}/\phi_{SSM} \approx 0.31$, then the predicted capture rate in Gallium is $\langle \phi_\sigma \rangle_{Ga} \approx 77 - 6S + 57S \text{ SNU} \approx 93 \text{ SNU}$, where $77 - 6S \text{ SNU}$ is the capture rate of the pp $\nu_\odot$'s and $57S \text{ SNU}$ is the capture rate of all other $\nu_\odot$'s. If the suppression is $S \approx 0.51$,

as observed in Kamiokande, then $\langle \phi \sigma \rangle_{Ga} \approx 103 \text{ SNU}$. Both predictions are in good agreement with the observations of GALLEX and SAGE. All these suggest that perhaps the difference between the results of the Cl experiment prior to 1986 and those of Kamiokande after 1986 are due to statistical fluctuations or systematic errors, allowing a standard physics solution to the $\nu_{\odot}$ problem.

Indeed, in this letter we show that the SSM predictions are consistent with the $\nu_{\odot}$ observations of Kamiokande, SAGE and GALLEX. This is achieved mainly by: (1) using an improved numerical stellar evolution code¹⁰ to calculate the evolution of the Sun from its pre-main sequence phase to the present stage, (2) using an updated solar luminosity¹¹ $L_{\odot} = 3.826(8) \times 10^{33} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ instead of $3.86 \times 10^{33} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ used before, which reduces the ${}^7\text{Be}$ and ${}^8\text{B}$ $\nu_{\odot}$ fluxes by 3% and 6%, respectively, (3) using the updated values $S_{34}(0) = 0.45 \text{ keV} \cdot b$ and $S_{17}(0) = 17 \text{ eV} \cdot b$ for the low energy nuclear reactions ${}^3\text{He}(\alpha, \gamma){}^7\text{Be}$ and ${}^7\text{Be}(p, \gamma){}^8\text{B}$, respectively, instead of $S_{34}(0) = 0.56 \text{ keV} \cdot b$ and $S_{17}(0) = 22.4 \text{ eV} \cdot b$, (4) suppressing the overestimated screening enhancement of bare nuclear cross sections in the solar plasma (induces only a minor change after the above changes).

The rate of the neutrino producing reactions in the Sun depends on the present conditions inside the Sun. These are obtained from calculating the evolution of the Sun from its pre-main sequence fully convective stage to its present ($t_{\odot} \approx 4.55 \text{ GY}$) stage. Its initial composition, which is not known accurately enough, is adjusted by requiring that the calculations yield the presently observed properties of Sun, i.e., its radius, luminosity, observed surface elemental abundances and an internal structure consistent with helioseismology data¹². The above scheme with the best available input physics (equations of state, opacities, nuclear cross sections) has been improved and updated continuously by Bahcall and his collaborators and

more recently also by other groups². Our predictions below were obtained with an improved stellar evolution code¹⁰ which contains diffusion and partial ionization of **all** elements, follows the full evolution of the Sun from its pre-main sequence stage until present and does not impose nuclear equilibrium at any stage. The code uses the thermonuclear reaction rates compiled by Caughlan and Fowler¹³ except for the changes explained below.

Low energy nuclear cross sections in the SSM were extrapolated from measurements at much higher energies, using the parametrization,

$$\sigma(E) = \frac{S(E)}{E} e^{-(E_G/E)^{1/2}} \quad (2)$$

where $E_G \equiv 2(\pi\alpha Z_1 Z_2)^2 \mu c^2$, Z_1 and Z_2 being the charge numbers of the colliding nuclei, μ their reduced mass and E their center-of-mass energy. $S(E)$ was assumed to vary slowly with energy. However, the above parametrization ignores the non negligible contribution^{1, 14} from partial waves other than s wave at the high energies where the cross sections have been measured and the effect of a finite nuclear radius R on barrier penetration, which induce an energy dependence in $S(E)$. Indeed, $S(E)$ was found to be energy dependent for some key reactions and its extrapolation to low energies became model dependent. However, the use of the correct Coulomb barrier penetration factor for finite size nuclei and the inclusion of higher partial waves remove most of the energy dependence of $S(E)$. In particular, for effective potentials $V = -V_0 \leq 0$ for $r < R$ and $V = Z_1 Z_2 e^2 / r$ for $r \geq R$, the induced energy dependence of $S(E)$ well below the Coulomb barrier and far from resonance energies is given by

$$S(E) \approx \bar{S} e^{-\frac{2}{\pi} \left(\frac{E_G}{E} \right)^{1/2} [2\sqrt{x} - \arcsin \sqrt{x} - \sqrt{x(1-x)}]} \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{S} = S(0) + S'(0)E$, $x = E/E_c$ and $E_c = Z_1 Z_2 e^2 / R$. That is demonstrated in Fig.2 for the reaction ${}^3\text{He}(\alpha, \gamma){}^7\text{Be}$, where we plotted $\bar{S}_{34}(E)$ as function of E , using $R = R({}^3\text{He}) + R(\alpha) = 3.82 \text{ fm}$ and the experimental data of Parker and Kavanagh¹⁵ and of Osborne et al.¹⁶ Indeed, $\bar{S}_{34}$ shows very small energy dependence at low enough energies where the contribution from higher partial waves is negligible. With this form for the barrier penetration factor, the world experimental data on the reaction ${}^3\text{He}(\alpha, \gamma){}^7\text{Be}$ yield $S_{34}(0) = 0.45 \pm 0.03 \text{ keV} \cdot b$, which is significantly smaller than the value $S_{34}(0) = 0.56 \text{ keV} \cdot b$ used by Bahcall and Pinsennault². Using the experimental data of Filippone et al.¹⁷ on the reaction ${}^7\text{Be}(p, \gamma){}^8\text{B}$ at low energies, where the contribution from higher partial waves is small, and the recent measurements by Motobayashi et al.¹⁸ of $S_{17}(E)$ at higher energies from Coulomb dissociation of ${}^8\text{B}$, which are free of the resonating p-wave and higher partial waves that contribute to the low energy cross section of ${}^7\text{Be}(p, \gamma){}^8\text{B}$, we find that for $2.4 \text{ fm} \leq R(p) + R({}^7\text{Be}) \leq 3.2 \text{ fm}$, $\bar{S}_{17}$ is practically energy independent and $S_{17}(0) = 17 \pm 2 \text{ eV} \cdot b$ (see Fig. 3). This value which we adopt was advocated before by Barker and Spear¹⁹ and it is significantly smaller than $S_{17}(0) = 22.4 \pm 2 \text{ eV} \cdot b$ used by Bahcall and Pinsennault².

Screening of the Coulomb potential of target nuclei by their electrons is known to enhance significantly laboratory nuclear cross sections at very low energies²⁰, although a complete theoretical understanding of the effect is still lacking²¹. Screening corrections to the nuclear reaction rates in the SSM are usually represented by an enhancement factor

$$F \approx e^{\Delta U/kT} \approx e^{Z_i Z_j e^2 / R_D kT}, \quad (4)$$

where ΔU is the gain in electronic potential energy when an incident ion of charge

$Z_j e$ penetrates the electronic cloud of an ion of charge $Z_i e$, T is the plasma temperature and R_D is the Debye length,

$$R_D \equiv \left(\frac{kT}{4\pi e^2 \Sigma Z^2 \bar{n}_Z} \right) . \quad (5)$$

The change in the Coulomb barrier due to screening is estimated from the Debye-Huckel approximation to the screened potential around a static ion in an electrically neutral plasma, ($\Sigma Z \bar{n}_Z = 0$, $\bar{n}_Z$ being the number density of particles of charge Ze with $Z=-1$ for electrons):

$$\Phi_i = \frac{eZ_i}{R_D} e^{-r/R_D} \approx \frac{eZ_i}{r} - \frac{eZ_i}{R_D} \text{ for } r \ll R_D. \quad (6)$$

This potential is an approximate solution to Poisson's equation near an ion of charge Z_i ,

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_i = 4\pi e \Sigma Z \bar{n}_Z = 4\pi e \Sigma Z \bar{n}_Z e^{-eZ\Phi_i/kT} \approx R_D^2 \Phi_i, \quad (7)$$

which is valid, however, only far from the nucleus where $eZ\Phi_i \ll kT$. In the core of the Sun where $kT \sim 1 \text{ keV}$ is much smaller than the Coulomb barriers ($\sim 1 \text{ MeV}$) between the reacting nuclei, most of the contribution to the nuclear reaction rates, comes from collisions with c.m. energies $E \gg kT$. At the classical turning point $eZ_j\Phi_i = E$. Consequently, inside the barrier, $eZ_j\Phi_i \gg kT$, and the use of the Debye-Huckel approximate potential at distances shorter than the classical turning point for calculating the barrier penetration factor¹ is unjustified. The Debye-Huckel solution also requires that the inter-ion spacing is much shorter than the Debye length, and that there are many electrons within a Debye sphere. Both conditions are not satisfied in the core of the Sun. It was found that when the

conditions for the validity of the Debye-Huckel approximation are badly violated in laboratory plasmas, the Debye-Huckel screened potential fails dramatically²² in reproducing various plasma properties.

Moreover, an ion that approaches from infinity a nucleus screened by an electronic cloud does gain electronic potential energy $\Delta U \approx e^2 Z_i Z_j / R_D$ when it penetrates this cloud. But, there is no gain in potential energy if either its initial position is already inside the electronic cloud (because the potential $\sim e Z_i / R_D$, is constant there), or the ion leaves and enters similar potential wells. Near the center of the Sun, where $\rho_c \approx 156 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, $T_c \approx 1.57 \times 10^7 \text{ K}$, $X_c(H) \approx 34\%$, and $X_c(He) \approx 64\%$, the average interion spacing is $n_i^{-1/3} \sim 2.8 \times 10^{-9} \text{ cm}$, similar to the Debye length, $R_D \approx 2.3 \times 10^{-9} \text{ cm}$. Furthermore, the effective energies of the reacting ions are much higher than kT and their velocities are similar to the thermal electron velocities, not allowing sufficient time for the plasma to readjust itself and screen effectively these ions. Consequently, both effects reduce substantially the energy gain due to screening and the resulting enhancement of the fusion reaction rates near the center of the Sun. The overestimated enhancement of **all** nuclear cross sections by screening in the SSM has a small net effect on the Sun but may be important for other stars and will be further investigated in numerical simulations of stellar like plasmas²³.

Our SSM predictions for the solar neutrino fluxes, obtained from the stellar evolution code of Kovetz and Shaviv¹⁰ with the above modifications are summarized in Table I. They are consistent, within experimental uncertainties, with the experimental results of Kamiokande, GALLEX and SAGE, and of Homestake after 1986. In particular, we predict $\phi_\nu(^8\text{B}) = 2.77 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ in excellent agreement with the flux measured by Kamiokande II and III, but we do not explain why the

$\nu_{\odot}$ flux measured by the Cl experiment prior to 1986 is smaller than the $\nu_{\odot}$ flux measured later by Kamiokande. A full account of our calculations will be published elsewhere.

Table I: Comparison between experimental results³⁻⁷ and the predictions of the SSM of Bahcall and Pinsennault² (BP), Turck-Chieze and Lopes² (LP), Kovetz and Shaviv¹⁰ (KS) and our predictions (DS) as described in the text, for the solar neutrino fluxes ($cm^{-2}s^{-1}$) at Earth and their capture rates (SNU) in ^{37}Cl and ^{71}Ga .

$\nu_{\odot}$ Flux	<i>BP</i>	<i>TL</i>	<i>KS</i>	<i>DS</i>	<i>EXP</i>
pp (E10)	5.95	6.02	5.99	6.04	
pep (E8)	1.41	1.39	1.38	1.40	
^7Be (E7)	4.75	4.34	4.91	4.30	
^8B (E6)	5.24	4.63	5.83	2.77	2.87 ± 0.17
^{13}N (E7)	43.9	38.3	6.11	7.47	
^{15}O (E7)	37.5	31.8	1.78	2.17	
^{17}F (E6)	4.72		4.85	5.21	
$< \phi\sigma >_{Cl}$	7.4	6.4	7.6	4.2	2.28 ± 0.23
$< \phi\sigma >_{Ga}$	128	123	123	109	87 ± 16

REFERENCES

1. D. Clayton, "Principles of Stellar Evolution And Nucleosynthesis", McGraw-Hill 1968.
2. For recent reviews see J.N. Bahcall and M. Pinsonneault, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **64**, 885 (1992); S. Turck-Chieze and I. Lopes, *Ap. J.* **408**, 347 (1993).
3. R. Davis Jr. et al. "Frontiers of Neutrino Astrophysics", eds. Y. Suzuki and K. Nakamura (Universal Academic Press, Inc. Tokyo, Japan, 1993) p. 47; K. Lande, *Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* **38**, 1797 (1993).
4. K. Nakamura, *Nucl. Phys. B (Suppl.)* **31**, 105 (1993).
5. P. Anselmann, et al., *Phys. Lett. B* **314**, 445 (1993).
6. A.I. Abazov et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 3332 (1991).
7. V.N. Gavrin et al., *Proc. XXVI ICHEP*, ed. J Sanford, (AIP, New York 1992) p. 1093
8. J.N. Bahcall and H. A. Bethe, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 1298 (1993).
9. A. Dar, *Proc. Baksan 1993 Intl. School on Particle Physics and Cosmology*, Baksan, Russia (April 1993, in Press).
10. A. Kovetz and G. Shaviv, *Ap. J.* May 1, 1994.
11. Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, III.2 (1992).
12. See e.g., J. Christensen-Dalsgaard and W. Dappen, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **4**, 267 (1992).
13. G.R. Caughlan and W.A. Fowler, *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* **40**, 284 (1988)
14. R.G.H. Robertson, *Phys. Rev. C* **7**, 543 (1973); S. Turck - Chieze et al., *Ap. J.* **335**, 415 (1988).

15. P.D. Parker and R.W. Kavanagh, Phys. Rev. **131**, 2578 (1963).
16. J.L. Osborne et al., Nucl. Phys. A **419**, 115 (1984).
17. B.W. Filippone et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 412 (1983); Phys. Rev. C **28**, 2222 (1983); B.W. Filippone, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sc. **36**, 717 (1986).
18. T. Motobayashi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett., Submitted.
19. F.C. Barker, and R.H. Spear, Ap. J. **307**, 847 (1986).
20. S. Engstler et al., Phys. Lett. B **202**, 179 (1988).
21. T.D. Shoppa et al., Phys. Rev. C **48**, 837 (1993).
22. S. Goldsmith et al., Phys. Rev. A **30**, 2775 (1984).
23. A. Dar and G. Shaviv, to be published.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig.1: Comparison between the observed rates induced by solar neutrinos in the Cl (open circles) and the Kamiokande II (square boxes) experiments divided by the rates predicted by the SSM of Bahcall and Ulrich (BU) as function of time during the period January 1987 through April 1990. The dotted line is the average of the Cl data points, the full line is the average of the Kamiokande II data points.

Fig.2: $\bar{S}_{34}$ as function of E_{cm} as extracted from the cross section for ${}^3\text{He}(\alpha, \gamma){}^7\text{Be}$ measured by Parker and Kavanagh¹⁵ (triangles) and by Osborne et al.¹⁶ (full circles). The straight line represents the average $\bar{S}_{34}$ obtained from the world data (not shown here).

Fig.3: $\bar{S}_{17}$ as function of E_{cm} as extracted from the low energy cross section for ${}^7\text{Be}(p, \gamma){}^8\text{B}$ measured by Filippone et al.¹⁷ (triangles) and from Coulomb dissociation of ${}^8\text{B}$ measured recently by Motobayashi et al.¹⁷ (full circles).

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9401043v1>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9401043v1>

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9401043v1>